Interview Summary	Application No. 09/171,043	Applicant(s) Konnersman	
	Examiner James W. Myhre	Art Unit 3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *James Myhre*

(2) *Anthony Kahng*

(3) *Paul Konnersman*

(4)

Date of Interview   *Feb 21, 2003*

Type: a)☐ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
       c)☒ Personal [copy is given to 1)☒ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: *1 and 6-8*

Identification of prior art discussed:
Swenson et al (5,490,097)

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Applicant discussed how the invention differed from theSwenson invention. Specifically, it is was pointed out that Swenson was a functional based model, where the present invention was class-based. After further discussion it was determined that the features of Claim 8 in which each node had a plurality of roles assigned to it (e.g. four levels of roles with each role approved the results of the previous role) was not explicitly disclosed in Swenson. Specifici features of the other claims were noted which rendered the claims unclear as to the meaning and scope, such as the term "rendering" in Claim 1. The Applicant agreed to clarify the meaning of these features in the next response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

   i)☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

JAMES W. MYHRE
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3622

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required